arXiv:1704.03729v1 [physics.gen-ph] 8 Apr 2017

An observable criterion for superconductivity

Jacob Szeftel[1*] and Nicolas Sandeau[2]
[1]*ENS Cachan, LPQM, 61 avenue du Président Wilson, 94230 Cachan, France and*
[2]*Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, Institut Fresnel, F-13013 Marseille, France*

Ohm's law and the Joule effect are analyzed comparatively in normal metals and superconducting materials. Whereas Ohm's law applies in identical terms in both cases, the properties of the Joule effect turn out to differ markedly. An existence criterion for persistent currents is inferred from these peculiar properties of the Joule effect, as a consequence of the second law of thermodynamics. An experiment is proposed to check the validity of this work in superconductors of type I and II.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 74.25.Bt, 74.25.Fy

I. INTRODUCTION

The prominent signature of superconductivity, i.e. the property to sustain persistent currents in vanishing electric field, has remained unexplained[1,2] since its discovery[3]. In order to understand why this long-standing riddle has withstood every attempt at elucidating it[4] so far, it is helpful to recall the basic tenets of electric conductivity in normal conductors[1]. The applied electric field E accelerates the electrons in the conduction band, which gives rise to a current j. Eventually, the driving force $\propto E$ is counterbalanced by a friction one $\propto j$, exerted by the lattice, as conveyed by Ohm's law :

$$j = \sigma E \quad , \quad \sigma = \frac{x_0 e^2 \tau}{m} \quad , \tag{1}$$

where σ, x_0, e, m, τ stand for the conductivity, the electron concentration, the electron charge, its effective mass, and the decay time of j due to friction, respectively. Simultaneously, the work performed by the electric force is entirely transformed into heat, to be released in the lattice, through the Joule effect. As a consequence of Eq.(1), the observation[3] of $j \neq 0$ despite $E = 0$ seemed indeed to suggest $\tau \to \infty \Rightarrow \sigma \to \infty$. However, it is well-known[5] nowadays that both τ, σ are finite, provided the measurement is carried out with an *ac* current. Besides, the observable consequences of finite τ, σ, regarding the skin[6,7] and Meissner[8,9] effects, have been discussed recently[10,11].

Therefore the issue of persistent currents will be tackled here from quite different a starting point. Likewise we shall analyze the physical reasons, which might cause the Joule dissipation to be thwarted in a superconductor, undergoing no electric field. This will be done by making a comparative study of Ohm's law and of the Joule effect in normal and superconducting metals.

The outline is as follows : the conditions for a superconductor to be in thermal equilibrium are discussed in sections II; Ohm's law and the Joule effect are studied in sections III and IV, respectively; the existence criterion for persistent currents is worked out in section V, while an experiment, enabling one to check the validity of this analysis in superconducting materials of both kinds, is described in section VI. The results of this work are summarized in the conclusion.

II. THE TWO-FLUID MODEL

The conduction properties of a superconducting material will be analyzed within the two-fluid model[2,5,13]. In this framework, the conduction electrons make up a homogeneous mixture, in thermal equilibrium, of normal and superconducting electrons, in concentration x_n, x_s, respectively.

All of the electronic properties of the normal state are described within the Fermi gas[1] model. In particular, its Helmholz free energy per unit volume F_n depends on two parameters, the temperature T and the Fermi energy E_F, defined[1,14] as the chemical potential of independent electrons, i.e. $E_F = \frac{\partial F_n}{\partial x_n}$.

By contrast, the BCS state[12], describing the motion of superconducting electrons, is a many-body *bound eigenstate*, which entails that the BCS energy per unit volume $\mathcal{E}_s$ depends *only* on the concentration of superconducting electrons x_s. Unlike the Fermi gas, the BCS state is seen to carry no entropy[1,2], so that its free energy is equal to $\mathcal{E}_s$. Thus the chemical potential μ of the BCS state reads $\mu = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_s}{\partial x_s}$.

The equilibrium, achieved in the two-fluid model, stems from Gibbs and Duhem's law[14], which requires the whole free energy $F_n(T, x_n) + \mathcal{E}_s(x_s)$ to be minimum with respect to x_n, x_s, under the constraints $x_n + x_s = x_0$ (x_0 refers to the total concentration) and T kept constant

$$E_F(T, x_n) = \mu(x_s) \quad . \tag{2}$$

The peculiar properties of the Joule effect, taking place in a BCS state, will appear below to be solely determined by the *sign* of $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{E}_s}{\partial x_s^2}$.

III. OHM'S LAW

Owing to Fermi-Dirac statistics and $T << T_F = \frac{E_F}{k_B} \approx 3 \times 10^4 K$ (k_B stands for the Boltzmann constant), the electrons in a normal metal make up a degenerate Fermi



FIG. 1. Projected one electron dispersion $\epsilon(k)$ of occupied states ($\epsilon(k) \in [0, E_F]$) for $j = 0$ as a solid line



FIG. 2. Projected one electron dispersion $\epsilon(k)$ for $j \neq 0$ in the laboratory frame; the solid line represents most of electrons, which contribute nothing to j, whereas the dashed line corresponds to the few electrons responsible for $j \neq 0$; actually j is proportional to the length of the dashed line but the difference $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2$ has been hugely magnified for the reader's convenience, that is $\epsilon_1 \approx \epsilon_2 \approx E_F$; the dotted line represents empty one electron states; the arrows illustrate electron transitions, from occupied (dashed line) back to empty (dotted line) states, driven by the friction force

gas[1], wherein each one-electron state, with energy ranging from the bottom of the conduction band up to E_F, is doubly occupied (due to the two spin directions), whereas those states with energy $> E_F$ remain empty. The corresponding one electron dispersion curve $\epsilon(k)$ has been projected onto the direction of the applied electric field E, as pictured in Fig.1. Since the electron velocity is equal to $\frac{\partial \epsilon(k)}{\partial k}$ and thanks to $\epsilon(k) = \epsilon(-k)$, the resulting current j vanishes. The applied field E arouses a finite current $j \neq 0$ by accelerating $\delta x_n > 0$ of electrons ($\delta x_n << x_n$) from their initial wave-vector $-k_F$ up to their final one k_F, with k_F being such that $\epsilon(k_F) = E_F$. Therefore all electrons, contributing to j, have about the *same* velocity $v_F = \frac{\partial \epsilon(k_F)}{\partial k}$, so that the resulting current reads $j = 2\delta x_n e v_F$ (see the dashed line in Fig.2). Inversely, the friction force, exerted by the lattice on those electrons making up j, tends to bring $2\frac{\delta x_n}{\tau_n}$ of electrons per unit time from k_F back to $-k_F$, where τ_n, defined in Eq.(1), represents the average time between two successive scattering events[1] (see the arrows pointing to the dotted line in Fig.2). As the momentum change rate, involved in this process, is equal to

$$\frac{\delta p}{\tau_n} = -\frac{m v_F \delta x_n}{\tau_n} = -\frac{m}{e\tau_n} j \quad ,$$

Newton's law reads[10,11] finally

$$\frac{m}{e}\frac{dj}{dt} = x_n e E - \frac{m}{e\tau_n} j \quad . \tag{3}$$

Because the inertial force $\frac{m}{e}\frac{dj}{dt}$ has been shown to be negligible[10,11], the electric force $x_n eE$ and the friction one $-\frac{m}{e\tau_n} j$ cancel each other, so that Eq.(3) boils down to Ohm's law, as expressed in Eq.(1).

Ohm's law will be worked out now for a superconductor by proceeding similarly as hereabove. The $j = 0$ superconducting state is assumed to comprise two subsets of equal concentration $\frac{x_s}{2}$, moving in opposite directions with respective mass center velocity $v, -v$, which ensures $j = 0$. The driving field E causes δx_s of electrons ($\delta x_s > 0, \delta x_s << x_s$) to be transferred from one subset to the other, which results into a finite current $j = 2\delta x_s e v$. The friction force is responsible for the reverse mechanism, whereby electrons are transferred from the majority subset of concentration $x_s + \delta x_s$ back to the minority one ($x_s - \delta x_s$). It ensues from flux quantization and Josephson's effect[1,2,15] that the elementary transfer process involves a pair rather than a single electron. Hence if τ_s^{-1} is defined as the transfer probability per time unit of one electron pair, the electron transfer rate is equal to

$$\frac{x_s + \delta x_s - (x_s - \delta x_s)}{\tau_s} = 2\frac{\delta x_s}{\tau_s} \quad .$$

Newton's law entails again that the electric force $x_s eE$ and the friction force $-\frac{m v \delta x_s}{\tau_s} = -\frac{m j}{e\tau_s}$ cancel each other, which yields the searched result, identical to Eq.(1)

$$x_s eE = \frac{m}{e\tau_s} j \Rightarrow j = \sigma_s E \quad , \quad \sigma_s = \frac{x_s e^2 \tau_s}{m} \quad . \tag{4}$$

Although Ohm's law displays the same expression for normal and superconducting metals as well, it should be noted that $\tau_s >> \tau_n$[16].

IV. THE JOULE EFFECT

Because no electron contributes to j, but the few ones in concentration $2\delta x_n$ with $\epsilon(k) \approx E_F$, showing up as the dashed line in Fig.2, they are also the only ones to be instrumental in the Joule effect. Besides all of them have the same velocity v_F. Thus the well-known formula

of the power released by the Joule effect, $\dot{W}_J = dW_J/dt$ (t refers to time), ensues from Ohm's law as

$$\dot{W}_J = 2\delta x_n e E v_F = Ej = \sigma_n E^2 = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_n} \quad . \qquad (5)$$

The calculation of $\dot{W}_J$ proceeds quite differently in a superconductor for two reasons :

- whereas all electrons, contributing to j in the normal state, have the same velocity v_F, the electrons making up the BCS state exhibit different velocities. This point is illustrated in particular by the two electrons within a Cooper pair[17] displaying all possible velocity values, although all pairs of the BCS state share the same mass center velocity;

- while any electron in a normal metal may lose, due to Pauli's principle, an energy randomly distributed from 0 up to $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2$ (see Fig.2), conversely the corresponding energy change, experienced by the BCS electrons, due to the scattering of one electron pair, is uniquely defined, as will be shown hereafter.

In case of $j \neq 0$, the chemical potential of majority (minority) electrons, characterized by the average velocity v ($-v$) reads $\mu(x_s + \delta x_s)$ ($\mu(x_s - \delta x_s)$). During each elementary scattering process, a single pair is transferred from the majority subset to the minority one, which results into a total energy change

$$\delta\mathcal{E}_s = \mu(x_s - \delta x_s) - \mu(x_s + \delta x_s) = -2\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}\delta x_s \quad .$$

Since the transfer rate is equal to $2\frac{\delta x_s}{\tau_s}$, the Joule power $\dot{W}_J = -2\frac{\delta x_s}{\tau_s}\delta\mathcal{E}_s$ reads finally

$$\dot{W}_J = 4\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}\frac{\delta x_s^2}{\tau_s} = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_J}, \quad \sigma_J = \frac{(ev)^2\tau_s}{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}} \quad . \qquad (6)$$

The result in Eq.(6) is noteworthy in two respects :

- even though $\dot{W}_J$ is still proportional to j^2 as in Eq.(5), the conductivity σ_s, deduced from Ohm's law in Eq.(4), *differs* from σ_J

$$\sigma_s = \frac{x_s e^2 \tau_s}{m} \neq \frac{(ev)^2\tau_s}{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}} = \sigma_J \quad ;$$

- unlike $\sigma_s > 0$, the *sign* of σ_J, which sets whether the Joule heat will flow from the conduction electrons towards the lattice, as is always the case in a normal conductor, or conversely will flow into the *reverse* direction, is to be determined by the *sign* of $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}$. As a matter of fact, the searched criterion will be worked out by taking advantage of this peculiarity.

It is worth elaborating upon the striking differences, regarding the Joule effect, between a normal metal and a superconducting one, which stems from $\sigma_s \neq \sigma_J$. $\dot{W}_J$ reads in general

$$\dot{W}_J = -\sum_i f_i v_i \quad , \qquad (7)$$

where the sum is carried out on every electron in the conduction band, labeled by the index i, moving with velocity v_i and undergoing the friction force f_i. Owing to $v_i = v_F$ for all electrons contributing to j in a normal metal, Eq.(7) can be recast, owing to Ohm's law, as

$$\dot{W}_J = -\sum_i f_i v_i = -\left(\sum_i f_i\right) v_F = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_n} \quad . \qquad (8)$$

Hence the fact, that the *same* conductivity σ_n shows up in both expressions of Ohm's law $j = \sigma_n E$ and the Joule effect $\dot{W}_J = \sigma_n E^2$, is realized to result from the typical property of a degenerate Fermi gas, that all electrons, contributing to j, have the same and one velocity v_F.

However this is no longer true for the BCS state, because the velocity of each electron, contributing to j, can take a broad range of values. Accordingly, whereas the Joule power reads $\dot{W}_J = -\sum_i f_i v_i = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_J}$, the power, fed into the BCS electrons by the applied field E, is given, thanks to Ohm's law, as $\dot{W}_a = x_s e \sum_i v_i E = Ej = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_s}$, which results into $\dot{W}_a = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_s} \neq \frac{j^2}{\sigma_J} = \dot{W}_J$, by contrast with $\dot{W}_a = \dot{W}_J = \frac{j^2}{\sigma_n}$, as observed in a normal metal.

V. EXISTENCE CRITERION FOR PERSISTENT CURRENTS

The applied field E gives rise to the total current $j = j_n + j_s$, where $j_n = \sigma_n E$ and $j_s = \sigma_s E$, as required by Ohm's law. After E has vanished, j_n is quickly destroyed by the Joule effect. However what will occur to j_s depends upon the sign of $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s}$.

If $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} > 0$, the Joule effect will cause eventually $j_s = 0$ and the associated kinetic energy will be converted into heat, to be dissipated in the lattice, as happens in a normal metal. Inversely in case $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0$, the Joule heat is inferred from Eq.(6) to flow from the lattice *towards* the BCS state, which will cause the lattice temperature to *decrease*. However since such a spontaneous cooling of the electron system, isolated from the outer world in the wake of $E = 0$, would cause the *entropy* to *decrease*, and would thence be tantamount to *violating the second law of thermodynamics*, the searched criterion is deduced to say that persistent currents can be observed *only* if

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{E}_s}{\partial x_s^2} = \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0 \quad .$$

That this is a necessary, but no sufficient condition, can be understood by looking back at Eq.(2). The equilib-

rium of the mixture of normal and superconducting electrons will be stable provided

$$\frac{\partial E_F}{\partial x_n} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} > 0 \quad .$$

Both stable and instable cases are illustrated in Fig.3,4. Note that $\frac{\partial E_F}{\partial x_n} \approx \rho(E_F)^{-1} > 0$ where $\rho(\epsilon)$ is the density of one electron states in the conduction band[1]. At last in case $x_s \to 0$, there is $\mathcal{E}_s \approx \frac{\epsilon_c}{2} x_s$ where ϵ_c refers to the Cooper pair energy[17], which entails that $\mu(0) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_s}{\partial x_s}(0) = \frac{\epsilon_c}{2}$.

The experiments, to be discussed below, are aimed primarily at bringing evidence of the anomalous Joule effect, associated with a BCS state. Since every superconducting material is claimed here to be characterized by $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0 \Rightarrow \sigma_J < 0$, the experimental procedure will look for evidence of the sample temperature being *lowered* by the Joule effect.

To that end, a thermally isolated, superconducting sample is inserted into a coil of resistance R and self-inductance L. A current $I(t)$ is fed into the coil, which gives rise to a magnetic field $H(t)$, according to the Ampère-Maxwell equation[10,11]. Since Ohm's law reads $U(t) = RI(t) + L\dot{I}(t)$, where U designates the voltage drop across the coil, the work $W_a(t)$, performed by the induced electric force, exerted on the electrons of the sample according to the Faraday-Maxwell equation[10,11], is given by

$$W_a(t) = \int_0^t (U(u) - RI(u))I(u)du \quad . \tag{9}$$

The measured value of W_a, defined in Eq.(9), will be compared with the binding energy per unit volume, $E_b(T)$, needed for the superconducting sample to go normal. $E_b(T)$ is to be reckoned hereafter.

The sample, taken in its initial superconducting state $T = T_i < T_c, H = 0$ (T_c refers to the critical temperature), is heated up to T_c, where it goes normal. A magnetic field $H = H_c(T_i)$ ($H_c(T)$ stands for the critical field at T) is then applied and the sample is further cooled down back to T_i in $H_c(T_i)$, to ensure it remains normal for any $T \geq T_i$. Finally, thanks to the first law of thermodynamics, $E_b(T_i)$ is inferred to read

$$E_b(T_i) = \int_{T_i}^{T_c} (C_s(T) - C_n(T))\, dT \quad , \tag{10}$$

where $C_s(T), C_n(T)$ are the $H = 0$ specific heat in the superconducting and normal state, respectively. Note that $E_b > 0$ requires $C_s > C_n$, which is indeed confirmed experimentally[1,2,5,13], e.g. $C_s(T_c) \approx 3C_n(T_c)$.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL DISCUSSION

We begin with the case of a first kind superconductor[2,5,13], taken in the initial state



FIG. 3. schematic plots of $E_F(T_i, x_n)$, $E_F(T_f, x_n)$ and $\mu(x_s)$ as dotted, solid and dashed lines, respectively, in case $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial E_F}{\partial x_n} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} > 0$; the origin $E_F = \mu = 0$ is set at the bottom of the conduction band; the crossing points A, C of $E_F(T_i, x_n), E_F(T_f, x_n)$, respectively, with $\mu(x_s)$, exemplify stable solutions of Eq.(2); the tiny differences $E_F(T_f, x_n) - E_F(T_i, x_n)$, $E_F(T_i, x_n) - \mu(x_0 - x_n)$ have been hugely magnified for the reader's convenience



FIG. 4. schematic plots of $E_F(T, x_n)$ (solid line) and $\mu(x_s)$ (dotted line) in case $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial E_F}{\partial x_n} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0$; the crossing point D of $E_F(T, x_n)$ with $\mu(x_s)$ represents an instable solution of Eq.(2)

$T_i < T_c, H = 0$ (see A in Fig.3). $H(t)$ grows from $H(0) = 0$ up to $H(t_f) = H_f = H_c(T_f)$, so that the sample is observed to go normal at $T_f < T_c$ (see B in Fig.3). The first law of thermodynamics requires

$$W_a(t_f) = \int_{T_i}^{T_f} C_s(T)dT + E_b(T_f) - \frac{\mu_0 \chi_n H_f^2}{2} \quad , \tag{11}$$

where $W_a(t_f), E_b(T_f), C_s(T)$ are defined in Eqs.(9,10), μ_0 refers to the magnetic permeability of vacuum, while $\chi_n > 0$ designates the magnetic susceptibility of normal conduction electrons, comprising both T independent, paramagnetic (Pauli) and diamagnetic (Landau) contributions[1]. The kinetic energy, carried by the persistent eddy currents, typical of the Meissner effect, has been discarded from Eq.(11), because it has been shown[11] to be negligible with respect to E_b. As, due to $\sigma_J < 0$,

the Joule effect is expected to *cool down* the sample, we claim that Eq.(11) will be fulfilled with $T_f < T_i$, in full agreement with a remark by De Gennes (see[13] footnote in p.18). As checking the validity of Eq.(11) requires the previous knowledge of C_s, C_n, the critical temperature T_c must be low enough for $C_s >> C_\phi, C_n >> C_\phi$, where C_ϕ designates the phonon specific heat[1]. Accordingly, *Al* ($T_c = 1.19K$) might be a good candidate.

At last, note that the final state, illustrated by B in Fig.3, refers to a metastable equilibrium, because the stable position at T_f is rather at C in Fig.3. However, were the electron system to go spontaneously from B to C, this process would arouse, due to $H \neq 0$, persistent eddy currents[11], responsible for the Meissner effect, while the accompanying Joule effect would give rise to a negative entropy variation $\Delta S_{B\to C} < 0$, at odds with the second law of thermodynamics, as shown hereabove.

If $H > H_{c_1}$ is applied to a second kind superconductor at $T < T_c$, vortices[2,5,13], comprising the normal metallic phase, start growing at the expense of the superconducting matter, which eventually vanishes at $H = H_{c_2}$. Thus the sample is first taken in the initial state $T_i < T_c, H = 0$ (see A in Fig.3). Then $H(t)$ is increased up to $H(t_f) = H_f = H_{c_2}$ and $T = T_f$, which corresponds to B in Fig.3. Energy conservation, embodied in the first law of thermodynamics, requires

$$\begin{array}{l} W_a(t_f) = \int_{T_i}^{T_f} (C_\phi + C_s)\, dT + E_b(T_f) - \frac{\mu_0 \chi_n H_f^2}{2}, \\ W_a(t_f) = E_b(T_i) + \int_{T_i}^{T_f} (C_\phi + C_n)\, dT - \frac{\mu_0 \chi_n H_f^2}{2}. \end{array} \quad (12)$$

Because of T_c being higher than in first kind superconductors, both electron specific heats, $C_n(T), C_s(T)$ are negligible[1] with respect to $C_\phi(T)$, so that accurate values are barely available[18] for C_n, C_s, and the consistency of Eq.(12) cannot be checked experimentally, unlike that of Eq.(11). Nonetheless, an estimate of E_b can be deduced from Eq.(12)

$$E_b\,(T_m) \approx W_a(t_f) - \int_{T_i}^{T_f} C_\phi du + \frac{\mu_0 \chi_n H_f^2}{2} \quad ,$$

with $T_m = \frac{T_i + T_f}{2}$ and $\frac{|E_b(T_f) - E_b(T_i)|}{E_b(T_m)} < \frac{|C_s - C_n|}{C_\phi} < 10^{-2}$. However, due to $\sigma_J < 0$, we still predict $T_f < T_i$, which would testify for the anomalous nature of the Joule effect.

VII. CONCLUSION

The anomalous features of the Joule effect, taking place within a BCS state, have been shown to stem solely from $\sigma_s \neq \sigma_J$, i.e. the conductivity σ_s, deduced from Ohm's law, should differ from σ_J, the conductivity pertaining to the Joule effect, which lends itself to an experimental check, as discussed above. Likewise, the existence of persistent currents is warranted as a consequence of $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_s} < 0 \Rightarrow \sigma_J < 0$, because the Joule dissipation would run afoul at the second law of thermodynamics.

Besides, the property $\sigma_s \neq \sigma_J$ implies $\dot{W}_a \neq \dot{W}_J$, so that the BCS state can *never* be in *thermal equilibrium*, if $j \neq 0$. Here is a proof : consider the electron system in the equilibrium state, defined by $T = T_f, H = j = 0$ and represented by C in Fig.3, for which Eq.(2) is fulfilled. As H induces a Faraday eddy current[11] j, by growing from 0 up to $H_c(T_f)$, the electron system shifts away from C towards B along the plot of $E_F(T_f, x_n)$. Meanwhile, i.e. between C and B in Fig.3, Eq.(2) is no longer fulfilled because of $E_F(T_f, x_n) > \mu(x_0 - x_n)$, which demonstrates the first order nature of the H-driven superconducting-normal transition[2,5,13], by contrast with the second order transition, observed at T_c with $H = j = 0$, for which Eq.(2) is indeed fulfilled, i.e. $E_F(T_c, x_0) = \mu(0) = \frac{\epsilon_c}{2}$.

* corresponding author : jszeftel@lpqm.ens-cachan.fr

1 N.W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, Solid State Physics, ed. Saunders College (1976)
2 R.D. Parks, Superconductivity, ed. CRC Press (1969)
3 H.K. Onnes, Leiden Comm., 1206, 1226 (1911)
4 J. Matricon and G. Waysand, The Cold Wars, a History of Superconductivity, ed. Rutgers University Press (2003)
5 J.R. Schrieffer, Theory of Superconductivity, ed. Addison-Wesley (1993)
6 J.D. Jackson, Classical Electrodynamics, ed. John Wiley (1998)
7 M. Born and E. Wolf, Principles of Optics, ed. Cambridge University Press (1999)
8 W. Meissner and R. Ochsenfeld, Naturwiss., 21, 787 (1933)
9 F. London, Superfluids, ed. Wiley, vol.1 (1950)
10 J. Szeftel et al., Phys.Lett.A, 381, 1525 (2017)
11 J. Szeftel et al., to be published
12 J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper and J.R.Schrieffer, Phys. Rev., 108, 1175 (1957)
13 P.G. de Gennes, Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys, ed. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA (1989)
14 L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Statistical Physics, ed. Pergamon Press, London (1959)
15 B. D. Josephson, Phys. Letters, 1, 251 (1962)
16 K. Hashimoto et al., Science, 336, 1554 (2012)
17 L.N. Cooper, Phys. Rev., 104, 1189 (1956)
18 J.W. Loram, K.A. Mirza and P.F. Freeman, Physica C, 171, 243 (1990)